



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

in the following verses" (p. 53), and so forth. On this principle, any desired passage could be made to bear out the author's view of the religious development. It is interesting to note that, while the "priestly" account of the flood is classed among the purely "polytheistic" traditions, the "Jahvistic," in spite of its naïve anthropomorphisms, is placed on the third stage, together with the story of Babel (11:1 ff.), where the unsophisticated student would more readily find traces of polytheism! The whole treatment, in fact, savors too much of special pleading to carry conviction. The better way is still that of the unjustly abused "critical school," which judges the literature as literature, and makes the religious development follow the texts. All honest work along these lines must lead us ever onward to the truth.

A. R. GORDON

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE  
MONTREAL, CANADA

### THE MINOR PROPHETS

Of the literature upon the Book of the Twelve there is no end. Minor in naught but name, this group of prophets has increasingly made its appeal to interpreters during the last quarter of a century. There is now no lack of aids to their interpretation; hence every fresh addition to the literature must make good its claim to recognition. The four works<sup>1</sup> which are to be noticed here are worthy of a place in every student's library. Among them they touch the Minor Prophets on every side, giving attention alike to form, content, origin, and purpose.

Sievers and Guthe put forth an arrangement of the text of Amos in accordance with the well-known metrical system of the former. The study includes the Hebrew text as reconstructed by Sievers, a transliteration and metrical analysis of the reconstructed text by Sievers, a discussion of the meter and style by Sievers, textual, metrical, and critical notes by

<sup>1</sup> *Amos metrisch bearbeitet.* Von Eduard Sievers und Hermann Guthe. [Des XXIII Bandes der Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Klasse der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, No. III.] Leipzig: Teubner, 1907. 91 pages. M. 5.

*Ausgewählte poetische Texte des Alten Testaments in metrischer und strophischer Gliederung zum Gebrauch in Vorlesungen und Seminar-Uebungen und zum Selbststudium.* Heft 2. "Amos, Nahum, Habakkuk," herausgegeben von W. Staerk. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908. ix+25 pages.

*La composition du livre d'Habacuc.* Par F. Nicolardot. Paris: Fischbacher, 1908. 99 pages.

*Études bibliques.* "Les douze petits Prophètes." Traduits et commentés par A. van Hoonacker. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie., 1908. xxiii+759 pages. Fr. 20.

Sievers and Guthe, and an account of the origin of the Book of Amos by Sievers. That the results do not lack in novelty and daring may be gathered from the fact that the text of Amos is distributed among thirty-six sections and subsections, and that of the 145 verses constituting the book only about 100 verses are allowed to Amos himself, and these have not been left in their original purity. The exigencies of the metrical system are responsible for many of these omissions; e. g., 3:7, 8 are regarded as interpolations solely because the meter here changes to tetrameter in a pentameter context. In 4:1-3, on the other hand, in order to secure alternating lines of eight and four beats respectively, it becomes necessary to suppose the loss of fourteen beats; while in 4:6-12, where alternating lines of eight and three beats are desired, fifty-nine words are dropped at least thirty-three of them for metrical reasons only. These are typical passages. Only an exceedingly strong metrical theory can carry such heavy burdens. Not only so, but the meter sometimes is made in disregard of the sense, e. g., in 1:3 the phrase *לֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ* certainly belongs logically with the preceding line rather than with the following; and, again, in 7:1 it is surely impossible to close line 1 with *יִרְצֶה*, leaving its object *גְּבִי* to open a new line with which it has no close connection. These and many other similar difficulties are due to Sievers' fondness for seven-beat lines, of which he finds 107 in a total of 180 lines of genuine text. Other meters are the hexameter, pentameter, tetrameter, and trimeter.

On the basis of his metrical finding, Sievers ventures a theory as to the origin and history of the prophecies of Amos in book form. Long logically integrated addresses or poems are not to be expected from Amos, a man of the people addressing the people. Short pithy comments on current affairs and conditions are the only utterances possible for such a one. Three main collections of such oracles may be traced in the book, viz., I, twelve heptameters in 1:3-2:2, eight in each of the sections 2:6-8+2:14-16; 5:18-25; 6:1-11; 7:1-6; 7:7, 8+8:1, 2; 9:1-4; II, twelve lines in 2:9-13+3:1, 2, eight lines in each of sections 3:3-8; 3:9-12; 4:1-3, four lines each in 5:1-3 and 5:4-6, and two in 5:14; III, three lines in 4:4, 5, ten lines in 4:6-12, seven in 5:7-13, three in 5:16, 17, five in 8:4-8, eight in 8:9-14+8:3. Each of these original groups was closed by one of the three doxologies; the meter of the second and third groups varies. Group I formed the nucleus for our existing book; into this II was first inserted as a whole, leaving the order of I undisturbed except at the point of its entrance. Then III was inserted into the combined I and II, having first been broken up into three sections and articulated with the composite

work at three different points. Finally this joint product was given homogeneity and polish by an editor who attached glosses, transition passages, and superscriptions wherever necessary to the sense.

A firmer support for such a complicated hypothesis would seem to be required than is afforded by the necessities of a metrical system which is as yet on trial. No other considerations can be adduced demanding such a complete upheaval of current opinions concerning the logical continuity of the Book of Amos. The improbability of the results arrived at upon this metrical basis seems to be good ground for calling in question the system which has produced them. The fact that Sievers and Guthe independently arrived at the same essential results (p. 3) is evidence only of the fact that where the same principles and methods are employed the results attained are necessarily almost identical. With such treatment, the Old Testament writings cease to be finished products and become only raw material from which the artificer may create a new construction according to his own skill and fancy. The place of metrics in textual and literary criticism is only subordinate and supplementary to other more objective disciplines; it can never assume the leading rôle with safety.

Staerk's metrical and strophic arrangement of the text of Amos, Nahum, and Habakkuk furnishes good opportunity for comparison with the results of Sievers and Guthe. Declaring himself a disciple of Sievers, he yet deplores the fact that the latter did not have better guidance in the application of his metrical system to the text of Amos. Staerk's preface is devoted to an attack upon Beer, the purpose of which is to clear himself of certain aspersions upon his ability as a metricist made by the latter in a review of Heft I of this series of selected poetical texts. Beer can scarcely be said to have gained anything by the encounter.

While accepting Sievers' views as to the metrical bases of feet and lines, Staerk differs from his master in refusing to make identity of metrical structure the test of a poem's unity. In chaps. 1 and 2 of Amos, for example, where Sievers eliminates everything not falling into heptameters, Staerk finds room for lines of 3+3, 2+2, 3+2+2, 2+3, and 2+2+3 beats each respectively; and all this within the limits of one poem, or address! In 4:1-3, where Sievers finds so much confusion in his endeavor to restore a poem with alternating lines of eight and four beats, Staerk permits the following variety of meter: line 1, 3+2+2 beats; line 2, 2+2+2+2 beats; lines 3 and 4, 3 beats each; line 5, 3+3 beats; and line 6, 2+2+3 beats. In addition, it becomes necessary to regard כִּי הִנֵּה in vs. 2 as outside of the meter; hence, in reality, no two of the six lines have the same number of beats. Indeed no piece of more than four lines

in extent is composed throughout in the same meter. Judging from the work of these two exponents of the newer metrical science, we are forced either to permit the wildest metrical license within a poem, or to resolve the poetical pieces of the Old Testament into their original metrical elements and reorganize them on the basis of metrical uniformity into entirely new poems. These alternatives are alike unreasonable.

But whatever may be thought of Staerk's metrical analyses of his larger poetic unities, it must be granted that he has fully recognized the force of the parallelism and given it its proper place in the determination of his metrical lines. Furthermore, his strophical groups are logical units and the strophes of any given poem are constituted of a uniform number of lines. Here he has more in common with scholars like Duhm, Cornill, Marti, and Harper, than with Sievers.

Van Hoonacker's attitude toward metrical and strophical questions is revealed by these remarks at the close of a review of the poetical reconstructions of Müller, Löhr, Baumann, Zenner, Sievers, Condamin, Marti, Elhorst, and Harper:

The divergences of which we have just cited some examples do not by any means prove that the theory of the strophic composition of the prophetic discourses is arbitrary and rests upon no real basis. On the contrary, we shall find in them a stimulus to the pursuit of this study with greater caution and zeal. But while waiting till the laws which controlled this kind of literary composition among the Hebrews may be better known, it would be hazardous to be in too great haste to take the exigencies of strophic distribution as a criterion of the authenticity or of the order of texts, even for Amos.

Consequently, no consideration is given to metrical matters in the commentary proper.

It is no easy task to interpret the Book of the Twelve within the limits of a single volume. To Van Hoonacker belongs the credit of having done this well and of having produced the most complete commentary on the Minor Prophets as a whole to be credited to the last half-century. A new translation furnishes the basis of the commentary. Herein the author appears most venturesome. Many emendations are incorporated in the text, some of them here presented for the first time. These are often more ingenious than convincing; e. g., Hos. 4:5, *וְדִמִּיתִי אֶמֶךְ* becomes *וְדִבִּיתִי יָמֶךְ*, i. e., "night shall be the likeness of thy day." Again, Hos. 11:7, a difficult text, becomes "the men of my people will be hung near their cities, and in the sight of those going up to their towns; none will raise them up." In Amos 5:9, *שֹׁד עַל עוֹז*, "destruction upon the strong," is changed to *יִשֶּׁע עַל-עֲנִי*, "deliverance upon the weak;" and in Mic.

2:8, שלמה אדר is transmuted into שלמנאצר, "Shalmanezzer." Similar freedom and boldness are manifested in the readiness with which recourse is had to glosses and transpositions.

The authority of the superscriptions, however, seems to weigh heavily upon the author. Amos, Hosea, and Micah belong as a whole to the prophets whose names they carry. The same holds good of Obadiah, Zephaniah, Habakkuk, and even Zechariah. Yet the method and spirit of the commentary are thoroughly historical and an honest endeavor is made to look all the facts squarely in the face. Theological presuppositions and prejudices are left largely out of consideration. Hence the commentary is to be cordially commended to all students as a competent and conservative exposition of the Minor Prophets.

It would have been of far greater value had the author seen fit to recognize the poetic form of the prophetic utterances and to give it full weight in his interpretation. No scientific treatment of these books can afford to ignore this element in their composition. A less strenuous attempt to establish the unity of each book would likewise have saved the author from the exercise of much ingenuity. For example, in the seventh chapter of Micah, which clearly deals with more than one period and set of conditions, van Hoonacker finds it necessary to place vss. 11b-13 between vss. 6 and 7. Vss. 1-6 clearly describe the retrograde condition of Israel, while vss. 11-13 describe the rebuilding of the city walls, the return of the exiles, and the prosperity awaiting Israel in the messianic age. But van Hoonacker interprets vss. 11b-13 as describing an invasion of foreigners coming to chastise Israel for the sins depicted in vss. 1-6. This interpretation of vss. 11b-13 is entirely out of harmony with the language of those verses which is certainly that of promise rather than threat. Making due allowance, however, for the author's point of view, much may be learned from him; his work repays careful study.

The point of view of Nicolardot in his treatise on Habakkuk is radically different from that of van Hoonacker. The latter treats the book as a unit, the former as composite; van Hoonacker considers it prose (with the exception of chap. iii), Nicolardot accepts it as poetry. The study falls into four chapters, preceded by an introduction and an extensive bibliography, the latter marked by too many errors; e. g., Arnold's article appeared in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, not in the *American Journal of Philology*; and Cornill's *Einleitung* is to the *Old Testament*, not the *New*. Chap. i contains a new translation with textual and critical notes, the text being arranged in strophes and printed in varying styles of type to indicate the different sources of

the material. Chap. ii is devoted to a presentation and criticism of the various attempts to maintain the unity of Habakkuk. Chap. iii presents, with discriminating criticism, the interpretations of the book involving its analysis into sources. In connection with this task the author's own view finds expression. Chap. iv traces the process of redaction which gave the book its present form.

In the poetical reconstruction no attempt is made to indicate the metrical analyses. The parallelism and the logic are apparently the main guides in the discovery of the various poetical units. In this respect Nicolardot agrees with the school of Ley, Briggs, Harper, *et al.*, rather than with Sievers and his followers. Staerk and Nicolardot agree practically as to the parallelism of lines; but in the organization of strophes their ways separate. Staerk finds strophes of various lengths, whereas Nicolardot arranges the whole book, with slight exception, in strophes of four lines each, in agreement with Marti and Duhm. In 1:2-4, for example, Nicolardot treats each of the three verses as a four-line strophe, while Staerk groups all three in one strophe. Again, in 1:12-17 Staerk discovers an eight-line strophe, whereas Nicolardot organizes three four-line strophes each with a two-line appendix, so to speak. In 1:2-4 Nicolardot has good basis for his division; in 1:12-17, however, the text is made to fit the strophe, as in the case of 1:13 where one line ends with the subject **רשע** and the verb is assigned to the following line. In his analysis of Habakkuk, Nicolardot follows closely upon Marti simply carrying Marti's principles a little further, and pushing the division hypothesis to its utmost limits. Four original constituent elements are laid down, viz., (a) a psalm consisting of 1:2-4, 13 and 2:4; (b) a second psalm, chap. 3; (c) a prophecy concerning the Chaldaean, 1:5-10, 14-17; (d) the series of curses, 2:5 ff. The oldest (c) dates from about 604 B. C.; the next in age (d) from about 550 B. C.; the first psalm, utilized by a redactor to bind (c) and (d) together, belongs somewhere between the fifth and third centuries; and the second psalm, (b), comes from the fourth century in connection with the oppression by Artaxerxes III. Glosses and redactional notes complete the whole. To this analysis it may be objected that the connection of 1:13 is at least as good where it is in MT, as it is when placed after 1:4, and that 2:4 is certainly more appropriate where it stands, as an answer to the prophet's problem, than after 1:13 with which it has no close connection, to say nothing of the fact that 1:14 follows well upon 1:13.

✠ The study shows wide acquaintance with the literature on Habakkuk and an intelligent appreciation of the problems raised by the book, as well as a good control of scientific method. It will serve admirably to put the

student *au courant* with the present state of opinion concerning the book, and may serve as an offset to Duhm's *tour de force* of converting Chaldaeans into Greeks in order to preserve the unity of the prophecy.

JOHN MERLIN POWIS SMITH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## RECENT CRITICISM OF THE SYNOPTIC NARRATIVES

Among the most important contributors to solution of the great problems of this field are certainly to be reckoned Wellhausen, Harnack, and B. Weiss, the first the most distinguished living expert in Semitic philology and the analysis of sources as combined in the narrative books of the Old Testament, the second of equal pre-eminence in the field of patristics and church history, the third a veteran in the special field into which the other two bring the qualifications of experience in outside yet closely related sciences.

In three "Contributions to New Testament Introduction," I, *Luke the Physician*, II, *The Sayings of Jesus*, III, *The Acts of the Apostles*,<sup>1</sup> Harnack proves the thoroughness of his method. He will not carry back his great work as historian of the post-apostolic age into the domain of the New Testament without working through again and for himself the whole task of New Testament critics in testing the sources in respect to date, authorship and credibility. And he begins where Wernle had advised, with the writings of Luke.

As I and II have already found an excellent translator<sup>2</sup> we doubt not the same service will soon be performed for III. But why need the pages be loaded with the Anglican mannerism which prefixes "St." before every name of apostle or church father, and substitutes "our Lord" for the simple "Jesus" of the original? Is it respectful to speak of David, Isaiah, and Socrates, and disrespectful to speak of Jesus and Paul and Ignatius?

Dominant German criticism has for years treated the tradition of the Lukan authorship of Luke-Acts as surviving only through the belated

<sup>1</sup> *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament von Adolf Harnack*. I, *Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1906. v+160 pages. II, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu, die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas*, 1907. iv+220 pages; III, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1908. vi+225 pages. Hereinafter the three works will be referred to respectively as I, II, and III.

<sup>2</sup> *Luke the Physician, the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles*. By Adolf Harnack, translated by Rev. J. R. Wilkinson. The Crown Theol. Library, New York: Putnam, 1907. 231 pages; \$1.50. *The Sayings of Jesus. The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. By the same translator and publishers, 1908. 318 pages. \$1.50.